7/22/72 Dear Howard, your 7/17 was delayed by insufficient postage. It didn't seem overweight to me, either, but it has 1/2 oz over, so when you include photocopies suggest you do not go by thickness but use the scale a friend gave me and I gave you.

A long and quite unpleasant morning devoted to the trouble-magnet nephew who is being hassled by the police for reasons I can't detect, who was arrested without warrant and on no evidence at all (released without my help, although handcuffed and taken to station after being stopped by at least three zooming police cars), and whose head does not get out together easily, restricts the time I have for answer. I've looked at the headlines on the enclosures and will read them when I can (th nks). Your photocopy and description of the Gary envelope duplicate mine. Thanks. You can argue this makes more innocent or more suspect/ I do not think suspect. But for it not to be, a whole lot of mail would have had to have been put in same "supposedly empty equipment". When you write to others to whom he may have sent, please ask if this happened to theirs and if it did for photocopies. Mine was "cancelled" on the back, too. The stamp cancellation was, I think, different.

Your question of 7/10 first. You ask if there is a death cert in Bud's files with notations in my handwriting. No. What I was referring to is the source Gary says he used to get an "independent" copy. That was what I'd gotten not voluntarily on their part from the Archives, what you did not get sent automatically and I didn't either. When I got it, it was with a covering letter from Rhoads dated, as I recall, 3/12/70. The copy Bud has is part of what he'd asked of me for the suit he was supposed to be handling as my lawyer, quite separate from the CTLA. It is a complete duplication of my Archives files. He asked for it and at considerable cost in paper and time I did it. It seems to have been gone over and put into the CTLA files. My letter is without response to this date. And as of the time I got this from the Archives, as I wrote Gary and carboned you, even if he could consider it "independant" to duplicate my work, knowing it was mine and having accepted copies in confidence as one of my duplicate depositories of all my stuff (no response to date), how could it be "independent" when the source he used he also accepted in confidence? I asked Jim for a copy of the list he said they had gotten from the Archives. He brought it and told me when he gave it to me that from the notation on it it seemed to be mine. To date my original has not been returned. Nor have I gotten any of my stuff back after more than two years. (This has gotten even more complicated because Dick Billings gave them his files. He apparently took his LIFE files with him when he left LIFE. I then gave him things in confidence. I have described to Jim what these are and asked for their return and for at least a view of anything he did with what I supplied him. I have in mind two things: what I got from Castorr for him that he was supposed to follow up; and the business of which I think you know nothing, a theft at Loran Hall's spontaneously done for me by one Corky Huston where Dick sent, of all people, LIFE's revanchist Cuban contact/correspondent, Miguel Acoca. Acoca blew the whole thing, Corky lost his job and has since had much trouble, we didn't get what he had, etc. You may recall that one of the misleading stories on Cubans in the Watergate caper was done for the Post by this same Miguel.) Castorr broke off a while back, and I suppose I now have less reason to wonder why. He and his wife had been kind and helpful.

I think you can now better understand Gary's long silence. There is nothing, not even by the remotest indirection, that is not literary thievery, whether intended, whether conceived as in Jerry's deathless words, as the requirement of "good conscience". Daily it becomesless of a figure of speech to describe this search for and misuse of my work as a minor industry.

When Lil read your letter, she asked if I were giving you typing lessons. You will see why. I'll not be able to address all of it.

Check on Wecht's "behavior not befitting anyone who calls himself a man" meaning. However, despite the way I feel about him I would not assume "it is very possible that Wecht instilled into Jerry that crap about 'crawling' to me." That is vintage Jerry as I know his mind and is repetition of Sylvia, I think you can realize, in Jerry's rewording.

Other misuse/theivery: it is in Sylvia's letter you asked for. I never told her what I had or had done on spectro, etc. Yet she refers to it. How does she know? Well, most likely, but not exclusively. There may have been more. This stuck in my mind. With Jim's agreement, unless the book is printed, I'm holding that for the Supreme Court. Or intended to. Again, the arrogant ignorant are so far out of it. Can you conceive a better forum? or place to make a public record and one that makes it public domain? I think you know me well enough to know that I would not lie about this, but if you want, you know where my suit files are and there you will find a new-stuff, labelled file under spectro. Don't let on to her unless you think she would tell you how she knew. If you think she would, ok. But if you do not let her know, she may inadvertently disclose more such misuse.

My interest in knowing if and when Wecht sees is tiring. I have only so much, am spread too thin, and want enough time to think of what may thereafter be necessary. It is not to interfere, etc. From what 'in told me, he may well have seen already, the impression I got from your words, because as my letter or memo indicates, he is making demands. Without knowing what he demands is not included, how can he make demands? And for what that hour conference with Lifton at the Pgh airport? I have not, by the way, done what I'd like to be able to, let it be known that he used Lifton. I presume Sylvia knows. It would be good for Gary to know, too. He ought to be beginning to understand what he is into and has done. Having done the inexcusable and being deep in self-justification, one of the few things that can jar him is Lifton. He knows Lifton is insane and knows Sylvia and Jerry know it. J did. You didn't have to tell him. He knew chapter and verse and lies if he denies. I told him. Warned him, I should say.

Your long p.1 graph Sylvia: I dig. She knew she'd be tempted to steal and there is nobody else from whom she can. I had taken a less ungenrous view hence was lead to misunderstand your interpretation. Of such is the kingdom.

Liebeler: if she can see no connection with the only thing that can have a connection, such the state of her mind, her ability to think where passion gets involved. Matter of fact, she told me Norton had returned her book after deciding to go for Liebeler's as yet unwritten, which can let you evaluate what you should know she had written that anything can get published and her's had no trouble. No doubt why it took from 1965 to late 1967.

Your graph on the "nuds of the WC" looses me, as I must lose others. I loaned her Excess, as I recall. Could you rephrase this graoh, which seems significant?

You are probably right in giving two laternatives about whatever the change in her is, that it is due to my letters, the second remaining unanswered and possiblyathe first only being involved, of she was cottoning to you, trying to con or soft-soap. You disclose no new contacts, so I presume there have been none. It may be difficult for her to change, but she has such a mind I believe she can is she can detach from her passions and lusts and yearning and past. Not impossible, in my view. Agreed unlikely. Esp after she gets over being off uppers.

She eliminated my reason for not sending a copy to you by telling you essentially the same thing I didn't want to spread around. I am sure you realize the potential for misuse against her of 20 years on uppers! But that was not until after I had gotten and responded to her letter. If you say her letter was sorrier than my response indicated, I think I can take it xx I was neither unkind nor unfair. I've heard too often that "how much everybody loves you and respects you" routine from too many who never meant it and so often acted the opposite to be influenced by it, but I guess you are right that she was making a play for my sympathies. As you do not say, she at no point responded to anything, never made contact with reality, and I think she knew and knows it.

Now that you dig the McG opening, can you better understand that "good conscience" and what it may cost? I have the Morris book. I've not read it, but I expect I have what is not in it and know I can refer to what is not that I opened for another, part of that long career of suppressing and sitting on things, no doubt, huh? Your last sentence discloses you do get the overallcontext of all the policies involved and that the CIA-mil-industrial complex is more involved than Geary's personal feelings. He's part, anyway.

Gotta get to other things. Thanks and best,